



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY OFFICE
7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100
ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2
TAIPEI 100 TW TAIWAN

COPY MAILED

SEP 30 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Lin, et al. :
Application No. 10/710,843 : **DECISION**
Filed: 6 August, 2004 :
Attorney Docket No. 13063-US-PA :

This is a decision on the petitions, filed 23 and 24 July, 2008, i.e., the “Renewed Petition to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment and Revive under 37 C.F.R. §1.181,” and considered as a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 (no fee) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application, and alternatively, to revive an application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is **DISMISSED**, and the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

As to the Request to Withdraw
the Holding of Abandonment

A proper showing (for relief under 37 C.F.R. §1.181):

- (as to non-receipt) requires at the very minimum: a statement from practitioner stating that the Office action was not received by the practitioner; a statement from the practitioner attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records for the application indicates that the Office action was not received with a copy of those docket records; and a brief statement of the calendaring process and a copy of the due-date (calendar) docket record(s) where the nonreceived Office action would have been scheduled for reply had it been received must be attached to and referenced in the practitioner’s statement; alternatively,

- (for a showing of timely and proper reply) requires a statement from practitioner stating that the reply was timely submitted by the practitioner; and copies of all papers submitted as and/or in support of that reply, with/and a copy of the date-stamped receipt card, Office FAX receipt acknowledgement (not simply Petitioner's FAX transmittal), or EFS receipt acknowledgment from the Office, along with practitioner's attestation as to the correctness/completeness of his/her records.

The showing(s) must include that of the person(s) with first-hand knowledge and an acknowledgment by the Petitioner that he/she has reviewed that information in compliance with his/her duty of candor to the Office. Petitioner has failed to make the showings of search and non-discovery with the documentary presentations discussed herein (and set forth in the footnote, *infra*, and the showings as to docketing and calendaring, again with documentary support—all in support of the averment of nonreceipt.

Petitioner's attention always is drawn to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c).¹

¹ The Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) provides in pertinent part:

I. PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT

A petition to revive an abandoned application (discussed below) should not be confused with a petition from an examiner's holding of abandonment. Where an applicant contends that the application is not in fact abandoned (e.g., there is disagreement as to the sufficiency of the reply, or as to controlling dates), a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.181(a) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment is the appropriate course of action, and such petition does not require a fee. Where there is no dispute as to whether an application is abandoned (e.g., the applicant's contentions merely involve the cause of abandonment), a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.137 (accompanied by the appropriate petition fee) is necessary to revive the abandoned application.

Two additional procedures are available for reviving an application that has become abandoned due to a failure to reply to an Office Action: (1) a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(a) based on unavoidable delay; and (2) a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b) based on unintentional delay.

A. Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure To Receive Office Action

In *Delgar v. Schulyer*, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971), the court decided that the Office should mail a new Notice of Allowance in view of the evidence presented in support of the contention that the applicant's representative did not receive the original Notice of Allowance. Under the reasoning of *Delgar*, an allegation that an Office action was never received may be considered in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. If adequately supported, the Office may grant the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment and remail the Office action. That is, the reasoning of *Delgar* is applicable regardless of whether an application is held abandoned for failure to timely pay the issue fee (35 U.S.C. 151) or for failure to prosecute (35 U.S.C. 133).

To minimize costs and burdens to practitioners and the Office, the Office has modified the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action. The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner ****>**describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log; calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.<

Petitioner presents no averment in support of the renewed petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181, and no documentary evidence in support thereof.

As to the Allegations of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where

The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the Office action was lost in the mail (e.g., if the practitioner has a history of not receiving Office actions).

Evidence of nonreceipt of an Office communication or action (e.g., Notice of Abandonment or an advisory action) other than that action to which reply was required to avoid abandonment would not warrant withdrawal of the holding of abandonment. Abandonment takes place by operation of law for failure to reply to an Office action or timely pay the issue fee, not by operation of the mailing of a Notice of Abandonment. See *Lorenz v. Finkl*, 333 F.2d 885, 889-90, 142 USPQ 26, 29-30 (CCPA 1964); *Krahn v. Commissioner*, 15 USPQ2d 1823, 1824 (E.D. Va 1990); *In re Application of Fischer*, 6 USPQ2d 1573, 1574 (Comm'r Pat. 1988).

B. Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Evidence That a Reply Was Timely Mailed or Filed

37 C.F.R. 1.10(c) through 1.10(e) and 1.10(g) set forth procedures for petitioning the Director of the USPTO to accord a filing date to correspondence as of the date of deposit of the correspondence as "Express Mail." A petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment relying upon a timely reply placed in "Express Mail" must include an appropriate petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.10(c), (d), (e), or (g) (see MPEP § 513). When a paper is shown to have been mailed to the Office using the "Express Mail" procedures, the paper must be entered in PALM with the "Express Mail" date.

Similarly, applicants may establish that a reply was filed with a postcard receipt that properly identifies the reply and provides *prima facie* evidence that the reply was timely filed. See MPEP § 503. For example, if the application has been held abandoned for failure to file a reply to a first Office action, and applicant has a postcard receipt showing that an amendment was timely filed in response to the Office action, then the holding of abandonment should be withdrawn upon the filing of a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment. When the reply is shown to have been timely filed based on a postcard receipt, the reply must be entered into PALM using the date of receipt of the reply as shown on the post card receipt.

Where a certificate of mailing under 37 C.F.R. 1.8, but not a postcard receipt, is relied upon in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment, see 37 C.F.R. 1.8(b) and MPEP § 512. As stated in 37 C.F.R. 1.8(b)(3) the statement that attests to the previous timely mailing or transmission of the correspondence must be on a personal knowledge basis, or to the satisfaction of the Director of the USPTO. If the statement attesting to the previous timely mailing is not made by the person who signed the Certificate of Mailing (i.e., there is no personal knowledge basis), then the statement attesting to the previous timely mailing should include evidence that supports the conclusion that the correspondence was actually mailed (e.g., copies of a mailing log establishing that correspondence was mailed for that application). When the correspondence is shown to have been timely filed based on a certificate of mailing, the correspondence is entered into PALM with the actual date of receipt (i.e., the date that the duplicate copy of the papers was filed with the statement under 37 C.F.R. 1.8).

37 C.F.R. 1.8(b) also permits applicant to notify the Office of a previous mailing or transmission of correspondence and submit a statement under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(b)(3) accompanied by a duplicate copy of the correspondence when a reasonable amount of time (e.g., more than one month) has elapsed from the time of mailing or transmitting of the correspondence. Applicant does not have to wait until the application becomes abandoned before notifying the Office of the previous mailing or transmission of the correspondence. Applicant should check the private Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system for the status of the correspondence before notifying the Office. See MPEP § 512.

C. Treatment of Untimely Petition To Withdraw Holding of Abandonment

37 C.F.R. 1.181(f) provides that, *inter alia*, except as otherwise provided, any petition not filed within 2 months from the action complained of may be dismissed as untimely. Therefore, any petition (under 37 C.F.R. 1.181) to withdraw the holding of abandonment not filed within 2 months of the mail date of a notice of abandonment (the action complained of) may be dismissed as untimely. 37 C.F.R. 1.181(f). Rather than dismiss an untimely petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 C.F.R. 1.181(f), the Office may require a terminal disclaimer as a condition of granting an untimely petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee. (However, it does not appear that a terminal disclaimer and fee are due here.)

Petitioner's statement on page 1 of the petition authorizing the fee "for Petition to revive unintentionally abandoned application" suggests that Petitioner intends the paper to seek alternatively relief as a petition averring unintentional delay consistent with the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b). The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)(3) require a statement that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) was unintentional." **Since the statement appearing in the paper read herein as a petition varies from the language required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)(3), the statement is being construed as the required statement. Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct reading of the statement appearing in the petition.**

BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

This application was held abandoned for Petitioner's failure to reply timely and properly (fees due) to the Notice of Allowance/Allowability and Fees Due mailed on 30 November, 2007, with reply due under a non-extendable deadline on or before 29 February, 2008.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 29 February, 2008.

The Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 10 March, 2008.

On 12 March, 2008, Petitioner filed the instant petition, asserting that the reply (fees due) was submitted via FAX on 19 February, 2008, with authority to charge fees to Deposit Account 50-2620, but that Petitioner failed to recognize until at least a day later that Petitioner had insufficient funds (it appears, only \$82.00) at the time the authorization was given, and thereafter, Petitioner avers, he transferred additional and sufficient funds to the deposit account.

Notably, Petitioner then failed to reauthorize the Office to charge the fees due before the due date. The final date for payment came and went without that authorization, and the application went abandoned. Clearly, the Office sought to act on Petitioner's instructions, but the state of Petitioner's deposit account made that impossible. Thereafter, when Petitioner avers he replenished the account, Petitioner gave no new instructions to the Office to charge fees before the due date for those fees. Thus, Petitioner lacked on the first presentation of the petition a showing that Petitioner:

- replied timely and properly to the Office action in question—rather, it was Petitioner's failure to maintain sufficient funds in the deposit account against which to charge fees due when Petitioner gave that authorization (on 19 February, 2008); and
- re-authorized that charge after he avers he replenished the deposit account and before the application went abandoned by operation of law.

Thus, the original petition was dismissed on 20 June, 2008.

The instant petitions, filed on 23 and 24 July, 2008, seek relief under 37 C.F.R. §1.181, but makes no showing in that regard. Alternatively, Petitioner suggests a petition averring unintentional delay, and so pursuant to the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), but does not present the petition, *per se*. **Since the statement appearing in the paper read herein as a petition varies from the language required by 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)(3), the statement is being construed as the required statement. Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct reading of the statement appearing in the petition.**

In this latter regard, it is noted that Petitioner twice authorized fees due as the reply (Issue and Publication Fees), and, as a result of Petitioner's error those fees initially were twice charged. However, the Office since has corrected Petitioner's error and refunded the overpayment to Petitioner's deposit account. Thus, Petitioner's protestations as to this matter now are moot.

(While Petitioner may create her own forms, the risk inherent is that—as was the case here—Petitioner may fail to include, and so may so fail to satisfy, requisite elements under the regulation. Forms for petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) or (b) averring unavoidable delay and unintentional delay, respectively, may be found at the Office website: www.uspto.gov .)

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that the filing of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 does not toll any periods that may be running any action by the Office and a petition seeking relief under the regulation must be filed within two (2) months of the act complained of (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.181(f)), and that those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office are reminded to inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.²

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).

² See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on Petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application.^{3, 4}

Allegations as to the Request to
Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment

The courts have determined the construct for properly supporting a petition seeking withdrawal of a holding of abandonment.⁵ (See, also, the commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I)(A) and (B).)

And the regulation requires that relief be sought within two (2) months of the act complained of.

The petition fails to satisfy the above-stated requirements in that Petitioner failed make the showing required.

(See MPEP § 711.03(c) under subheading "Petition to Withdraw Holding of Abandonment Based on Failure to Receive Office Action," alternative "A Reply Was Timely Filed"; see also: "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received," 1156 Official Gazette 53 (November 16, 1993).)

As to the Allegations
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee. (However, it does not appear that a terminal disclaimer and fee are due here.)

It appears that Petitioner has satisfied the requirements of the regulation.

³ See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition. (Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.) Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable. Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter. Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care. (By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.))

⁵ See: Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971).

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is dismissed, however, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is granted.

The instant application is released to Publications Branch to be processed into a patent in due course.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the instant decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the Publications Branch in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to that change in status need be directed to the Publications Branch where that change of status must be effected—that does not occur in the Office of Petitions.

While telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214, it is noted that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2⁶) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./
John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁶ The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

**PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT
ABANDONED UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)**

Docket Number (Optional)

First named inventor:

Application No.:

Art Unit:

Filed:

Examiner:

Title:

Attention: Office of Petitions

Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

FAX (571) 273-8300

NOTE: If information or assistance is needed in completing this form, please contact Petitions Information at (571) 272-3282.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to a notice or action by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The date of abandonment is the day after the expiration date of the period set for reply in the office notice or action plus an extensions of time actually obtained.

APPLICANT HEREBY PETITIONS FOR REVIVAL OF THIS APPLICATION

NOTE: A grantable petition requires the following items:

- (1) Petition fee;
- (2) Reply and/or issue fee;
- (3) Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee - required for all utility and plant applications filed before June 8, 1995; and for all design applications; and
- (4) Statement that the entire delay was unintentional.

1. Petition fee

☐ Small entity-fee \$ _____ (37 CFR 1.17(m)). Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27.

☐ Other than small entity - fee \$ _____ (37 CFR 1.17(m))

2. Reply and/or fee

A. The reply and/or fee to the above-noted Office action in the form of _____ (identify type of reply):

- ☐ has been filed previously on _____.
- ☐ is enclosed herewith.

B. The issue fee and publication fee (if applicable) of \$ _____.

- ☐ has been paid previously on _____.
- ☐ is enclosed herewith.

[Page 1 of 2]

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.137(b). The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 1.0 hour to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

3. Terminal disclaimer with disclaimer fee

- ☐ Since this utility/plant application was filed on or after June 8, 1995, no terminal disclaimer is required.
- ☐ A terminal disclaimer (and disclaimer fee (37 CFR 1.20(d)) of \$ _____ for a small entity or \$ _____ for other than a small entity) disclaiming the required period of time is enclosed herewith (see PTO/SB/63).

- 4. STATEMENT:** The entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. [NOTE: The United States Patent and Trademark Office may require additional information if there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional (MPEP 711.03(c), subsections (III)(C) and (D)).]

WARNING:

Petitioner/applicant is cautioned to avoid submitting personal information in documents filed in a patent application that may contribute to identity theft. Personal information such as social security numbers, bank account numbers, or credit card numbers (other than a check or credit card authorization form PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes) is never required by the USPTO to support a petition or an application. If this type of personal information is included in documents submitted to the USPTO, petitioners/applicants should consider redacting such personal information from the documents before submitting them to the USPTO. Petitioner/applicant is advised that the record of a patent application is available to the public after publication of the application (unless a non-publication request in compliance with 37 CFR 1.213(a) is made in the application) or issuance of a patent. Furthermore, the record from an abandoned application may also be available to the public if the application is referenced in a published application or an issued patent (see 37 CFR 1.14). Checks and credit card authorization forms PTO-2038 submitted for payment purposes are not retained in the application file and therefore are not publicly available.

Signature_____
Date_____
Typed or printed name_____
Registration Number, if applicable_____
Address_____
Telephone Number_____
AddressEnclosures: ☐ Fee Payment☐ Reply☐ Terminal Disclaimer Form☐ Additional sheets containing statements establishing unintentional delay☐ Other: _____**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☐ Deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☐ Transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

Date_____
Signature_____
Typed or printed name of person signing certificate

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (*i.e.*, GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.